

MAR 21 1947

LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

General Issue

Foxholes in the Classroom *James H. Hanscom* 324

Education in the Rehabilitation of Maladjusted
Personalities *W. B. Brookover* 332

A Protocol for an Effective Democratic Education
S. E. Frost, Jr. 341

Judicial Attitudes Toward Colored Minorities
and Education *J. Hartt Walsh* 345

Progressive Education in the U.S.S.R.
Salomon M. Teitelbaum 356

On the Problem of America's Cultural Minorities
Joseph Schneider 366

The Basic Defect in Our Education *Rudolph M. Binder* 376

Editorial, 321

FEBRUARY 1947

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

32 WASHINGTON PLACE, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

Editorial Staff

E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor-in-Chief* JOHN C. PAYNE, *Asst. Managing Editor*
DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Editor* JEAN B. BARR, *Business Manager*
HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, RHEA K. BOARDMAN, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, HERMAN A. ERNST, STEPHEN G. RICH, I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, *Associate Editors*

Permanent Departments

Significant Developments in Education, E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor*
Book Reviews, HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, *Editor*

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

Board of Trustees

E. GEORGE PAYNE, <i>President</i>	MARTIN G. HALPRIN
HERMAN A. ERNST, <i>Vice-President</i>	HERBERT D. HARPER
HENRY MEISSNER, <i>Secretary</i>	STEPHEN G. RICH
TORD E. HOLMBERG, <i>Treasurer</i>	I. DAVID SATLOW
DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Trustee</i>	

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, Room 51, 32 Washington Place, New York 3, N. Y. Editorial office, Room 41, 32 Washington Place, New York 3, N. Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 20

February 1947

No. 6

EDITORIAL—SOME REFLECTIONS ON SAFETY EDUCATION

It has been extremely interesting to see the emphasis on safety education in the colleges and universities of the country that I have visited in ten thousand miles of travel in twenty-five states during the past year. In all the colleges and universities that I have visited courses in safety education are given and some schools give credit for these courses which are accepted as part fulfillment of the requirements for advanced degrees. Can my readers imagine that in some of our largest and most important universities courses in safety education are accepted in the arts division as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy?

The discovery of this emphasis at firsthand makes me reflect upon the history of safety education in the past thirty years since its beginning in the St. Louis schools, for it was in 1916 and 1917 that the elementary schools of St. Louis began the teaching of safety as a part of the regular curriculum, and the Harris Teachers College in that city began its experimental work that has developed into the present well-nigh universal practice in the public schools and the higher institutions of learning in this country.

It was in 1919 that the first edition of *Education in Accident Prevention* was published, a book that has sold more than fifty

Copyright 1947 by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

thousand copies.¹ In this book the theory was advanced that the purpose of education should serve the needs of the community, and that wherever there was need of better living the schools had a distinct responsibility. Furthermore, it was argued in this book that the loss of life, greater than in war for the war years, and the loss of time, the cost, and the suffering from injury resulting from accidents demanded that the schools of the country assume as one of its responsibilities the prevention of accidents. It not only insisted that the schools ought to teach children how to act to avoid accidents, and to avoid the physical hazards incident to the modern complex civilization, but it also showed through an experimental program in the Harris Teachers College experimental school that the effect of instruction was the reduction of accidents in the school community and finally in the city.² In a word it was claimed and demonstrated that the prevention of accidents was a function of education and that education did achieve effective results.

Furthermore, the thesis of this book and the program it described was that safety education should be introduced into the curriculum as a feature of instruction in the regular school subjects and that the new subject matter and emphasis could enrich immeasurably the whole program of school instruction. It is interesting to find that the point of view presented as a result of this first experimental program in safety education has been completely accepted today, both in the public schools and the institutions of higher learning.

It is interesting also to note that it was only through pressure from interested citizens, as members of the National Safety Council, that school superintendents gave time on their educational programs for teachers to discuss the need of safety instruction. The director of this first experiment in safety education traveled 17,000 miles, throughout the states, in 1920, from New York to Salt Lake City,

¹ See E. George Payne, *Education in Accident Prevention* (Chicago: Lyons and Carnahan, 1919).

² See E. George Payne, Bulletin 32, 1922, United States Office of Education.

Utah, and made seventy-five speeches. Not one speech was given upon the initiative of an educator, but through pressure exercised by citizens of the community. Educators were simply not interested in safety education in 1920.

In 1926 the National Society for the Study of Education published a Yearbook on Safety Education, and I was assigned the problem of discovering the extent to which schools of education and teachers colleges emphasized in their curriculum the need of accident prevention through school instruction. Three institutions admitted some emphasis, but only one, New York University, offered courses in education in accident prevention. Many of the college administrators were angry at the inquiry, and one told me frankly that: "If you will spend your time in seeing that the courts and officers of the law perform their duties, and leave the schools free to perform their essential tasks—the teaching of fundamentals of history, arithmetic, spelling and reading—you will perform a great task for education."

We shall have to conclude from what we have seen in all the institutions of the present that education does move forward, that there is a new social emphasis on all sides, and that if the people of this great country will take education seriously, provide adequate support so that the profession of education will attract educational statesmen to its ranks, the future of this country will be safe and the country will be made greater through its schools.

E. GEORGE PAYNE

FOXHOLES IN THE CLASSROOM

James H. Hanscom

Everybody wrote an article; everybody read a book. Everybody learned a decalogue entitled "What Thou Shalt Do With G.I. Joe When He Comes Home From The War."

But nobody asked what the "boys" might demand of them, now that the boys were men. Nobody sensed that a challenge might be coming from the foxholes and the submarines. The emphasis was on how to help Joe readjust to the world he had left behind, denying the most patent truth of all experience that men do not return to that which they have outgrown, that time has no stop, much less a reversal, that "you can't go home again."

And when Joe returned, docile and silent, burying his fears and insecurities behind a grin, everybody relaxed with a sigh of relief and re-focused on important things like sugar shortages and nylon hose.

But whether he had been gone a year or five, it was a different guy inside the pre-service suit now pinching him across the shoulders. Somewhere along the way, in boot camp or preflight, at Salerno or Iwo Jima, experience had stirred a sleeping atavism and had shaped within him an Americanism akin to the frontier Americanism which had vanished before he was born.

Compelling as the frontier was as the great single determinant of our national personality, it passed two generations ago. Coincidentally fresh problems of Americanization rose with the arrival of immigrant hordes who perforce were urbanized and exempt from the pressures that had made the typically American character, for better or worse, recognizable among the peoples of the world.

The frontier virtues, honesty, hardihood, and simplicity, tenacity and humor, cognizance of the realities of living, and a ribald antagonism to pomp, duplicity, and high-sounding empty phrases, have

become, in our century, a silly lip service mouthed by fraternal organizations, schools, and politicians, only to be denied in the daily practice of our increasingly urbanized culture. In the dead center of our national blind spot has been our double standard, one code to prate, another to practice, puzzling to the alien observer who finds our verbal Americanism of "liberty," "square-dealing," and "democracy" at weird variance to our political, social, and economic activity.

Sixteen million Americans were snatched in six years from urban America, from twentieth-century double talk, from immigrant tenements, from Yankee farms, and islands of Southern retrogression, to be beaten by war's fist into a pattern strange to 1947 New York and Paducah and San Jose, but which would have loomed familiarly and in homely guise in the eyes of Boone and Lincoln, of Houston and Frémont, of Jackson and Anthony Wayne.

Let him, who on the school platform, in the labor leader's conference, or behind the employer's desk, is puzzled by Joe look back at the America that was; let him recall the once vital attitudes that have since become mere shibboleths, and instantly the G.I. stands shorn of mystery. Erase the jeep and B-29, the helmet and K ration, the paratroop boots or the discomfort of a pin-stripe suit, and here again is Lee's Army of Northern Virginia, Sherman's Westerners home from marching through half a continent, and the men of the wagon train and the mining camp out of America when it was young, ribald, formidable, and humane in its own callous way. The frontier permitted no regard for costume or Prussian parade, allowed no value to an officer system or anything else based on caste or useless customs: the forest, the desert, the Indian, all forced reality on those who would survive; nor were the lessons of Braddock or Burgoyne ever thereafter forgotten. Respect for the leader "who knew his stuff," not for the rank on his collar; respect for will and wit, toughness of fiber and spinal verticality—these were learned the hard way by the Smiths and Washingtons then, relearned in

bitter truth by the Capolozzis, Zdanowiczs, Levys, and Joneses today. A generation has become "American" in a sense that its compatriots no longer are, and the challenge that it flings will not be answered suavely, either by "defining terms" or "appointing a committee."

To say that all this lives again in Joe is not to suggest that he is yet fully aware of it. Often he knows only that now, in a way not true of him before, he wants "answers," and to find them he has poured into every school in the nation. He goes anxiously and willingly and incalculably unsure of himself, creating problems of housing and mass teaching that have obscured through their immediacy the greater issues of his true needs, or the realization that he is bringing a set of standards, a criteria for schools and teachers which they could well heed.

As the semesters roll by, Joe is beginning to know what he thinks of the schools, just as he is becoming more keenly aware of where he stands in relation to all society.

Today's most numerous student, he is a generation of fathers of tomorrow's students, and upon his support or ultimate rejection, as he turns away disillusioned and cynical, may hinge the continuing popular support of our present educational system.

Perhaps he has no right to judge, perhaps he should accept everything in the way of students (old style); perhaps he earns no right to anything by sweeping mines or by riding planes rocked by flak; perhaps loneliness, weariness, fear, and despair, sitting hard on a man's stomach or bitterly in his throat, should earn nothing more than a return to standing in lines or sitting in rows to hear platitudes and evasions bandied about safely above the level of living realities.

Or it may be, if democracy has not lost the great hurricane voice with which it shouted out of Virginia and Massachusetts when the nation was young, and out of Illinois in the middle years, that these many men have a right inherent in their numbers and their citizenship, a right for their voice to be heard above the squeak of the deflating windbags of social or scholastic custom.

What Joe most deeply desires is nothing high and holy, no dim, unattainable dream, no cataclysmic shaking of the structure of the universe; he asks primarily that society shall be consistent, that its sayings and its doings shall be cut of one cloth, and that the simple standards to which he has come to cling shall be more than the verbiage they so often are. Spiritual grandson of Jefferson and Custer and Franklin, he asks that his society, and the school that is his world in miniature for a while, shall be less "boy scoutish" in words and more real "scoutish" in action.

He asks for evidence of true scholarship, for profundity of thought. Perhaps the most serious psychic shock to Joe in uniform derived from the slow realization that his life was in the hands of those who showed little evidence of reasoning or judgment superior to his own. His ultimate spiritual rebellion was not against death: it was against *wasted* death. With a skull and crossbones set as a seal on his resentment against superficiality, he is not soon going to accept anything pedagogical that recalls to him many of his former sergeants, ensigns, lieutenants, or colonels. He has learned too well to look beneath pompous presence for circumstantial evidence. Glib surface will not convince him: he has seen better examples in military brass and naval braid than any instructor can parade from his own inexperience. The G.I. may be dismayed at his own inadequacy and his difficulty in following the "guy who knows his stuff," but he wants these "guys" who can help to do so by restoring some small feeling of security, by providing leadership he can honestly respect and follow.

He wants originality of thinking. He eyes askance the man who "hasn't had a new thought in twenty years." Observations echoing from the rostra of 1947, unchanged since their pronouncement on some educational Sinai of 1920 or 1890, leave him cold. The codes and the philosophies of the 1890's and the 1920's got him into the mess he had to fight his way out of, and now he will have a new word, a new thought untainted with social failure or past rejection. He has a healthy suspicion that anyone who has been mouthing the

same phrases for a generation, and the younger sycophants of such, who, re-mouth, parrotwise, the same phrases, has never done anything about any of these things.

The G.I. wants honesty. At this point arise the pharisees to chorus: "So say we all!" But lip service to the idea of honesty is no more identical with truth-telling, than "democracy" issued as a fiat by some school supervisors is one with the ideal for which men die. This is a glib nation, easily mouthing the stereotypes of "integrity," "fellowship," and "tolerance," but the moral halitosis so exhaled orally is too strongly reminiscent of the physical odor of some of our classrooms on rainy days. How shall our teachers do more than reflect our schools and our society? As long as little men fear to examine critically their own standards, as long as they are busy with the "busyness" of conforming to external patterns, as long as their vocality and the number of committees upon which they serve, and the number of luncheon clubs at which they roar, or moo, or rotate, is the measure of their success as citizens and teachers, so long will hypocrisy blow down a fetid breath from our rostra. History teaching that repeats the propaganda of dead centuries, classes in educational theory that perform a ballet of side-stepping all concrete examples that might pin the teacher to a truth or falsity, economics classes that preach assumptions as natural laws, classes in literature that scurry like mice among the ruins of ivory towers, classes of all kinds attuned to the prejudices of the local banker, the local politician, the local manufacturer, the local laborite, these exude a moral murk in which a G.I. Diogenes finds his lantern feeble and of little avail.

But honesty is the offspring of courage. The "gumption" requisite to forthrightness in the classroom is kindred to the quality that carried bank clerks through Anzio, converted golf caddies into combat engineers competent to clear the low-tide approaches to Omaha Beach. There is no magic on a New Hampshire farm to toughen a man's ribs against a stream of lead on Wake, no abracadabra found

in Arizona deserts to carry a lad through the soul-shrivelling monotony of endless months on a Greenland fiord; no man carries from the docks of Seattle or the pinelands of the Carolina Piedmont any talisman of invulnerability against antiaircraft fire from below or bombs from above. No man is born a Seabee, a marine, or a fighter pilot. But that to which none were born, many attained. And the measure of their attainment was the measure of the courage called into being by the exigencies of their living against odds. In the eyes of these men, how will the timorous and vacillating appear; how will there stack up the biped whose Argus eyes have grown spiritually crossed from fearfully watching his schoolboard, his supervisors, the parent-teacher association, and an endless array of other possible censors?

Tolerance is no ideal to the G.I. To most of his kind it is the accepted way to get along in a realistic world. He faces prejudice in a classroom with incredulity and more than a little contempt. The bias of the teacher whose resentment against a student taking a cut from a class for religious reasons took the form of flinging into the G.I.'s teeth the statement: "All the problems of this country are due to the people you come from!" is the sort of thing that welds all G.I.'s into an angry unit. The school that permits it because of the entrenched position of the biased teacher becomes a target for vitriolic scorn. The statement that the blood of all men is red is no mere figure of speech to Joe, nor has he learned it from a biology textbook. The buzz bomb that howled out of London skies at him, the disease that stalked him in the New Guinea undergrowth came not asking, "What church?" or "What kin?" Nor after Midway did the flags lie uneasily upon some in the rows of canvas-wrapped figures, in the last moments before the restless sea claimed them forever, because some of these bodies were brown and some were white. But flags are insensate symbols of man's greater hopes and could not be expected to reveal by a flutter of revulsion the neuroses of the safe and the untouched. It is not sentimentality that stands in Joe's

eyes when prejudice causes a hungry sea, a blasted earth, or a shattered sky to recur in startling focus. It is bewilderment that something so well realized by him can be still unlearned by others, especially by those who ascribe to leadership.

Against emotionalism, defeatism, and scholastic red tape, the G.I. brings the only weapon that he has learned is effective—humor. Its efficacy for him lies not in that it solves anything, but that it renders tolerable the frustrations of the classroom. No Bill Mauldin has yet appeared to make visual the academic foxholes and the reactions that bide behind the masks of Willie and Joe as they mentally duck into them. This is well for the peace of mind of those who would pontificate in a cloud of incense of their own self-esteem. The teacher who can subject himself to his own healthy objective sense of humor talks a language that will carry these men down the line with them.

There is an urgency in many of our G.I.'s, a desire to regain lost years of progress, and almost frantic fear that some of the days of his regaining may be wasted on trivia and nonessentials. Joe wants to erase, as soon as he can, the G.I. and wear in its stead the A.B., A.M., or Ph.D., and, while he may outwardly scoff at these letters and at the *cum laude*, he does it in the same way that he often jeered at his own battle ribbons, only to wear them later underneath his sweater and to look at them occasionally with pride when he thought no one was aware.

The G.I. record is good in our schools: it is better in those classes where living issues are faced forthrightly; it is best in those situations where Joe can give honest respect to those who aspire to teach him. And as long as his point of view can remain clear and unconfused, and in so far as schools and society meet the challenge of his recall to the ideals that marked America's past, there is hope that American moral virility will revive and raise itself from the dust heap where it has been languishing.

The frontier is no more; the circumstances that reawakened its

meaning, and brought it, out of its time, to a generation of Americans, will not, granting wisdom, come again. Its voice for a little while is sounding along university corridors and murmuring in college libraries. If it is heard and heeded, public education can move forward confident in the continued support that can come only from a critical people convinced of its worth. The alternative is plain. Its greatest opportunity for leadership forfeited, in increasing impotence our educational system must bend in ever more facile fashion to the nod of the captain of industry and the prod of the captain of labor, until eventually, with intellectual liberty liquidated, it will pass into the footnotes of history to be catalogued with all the human institutions that have met their hour of opportunity unaware.

The olive-drab opportunity with a buckskin glove over its golden knuckles is knocking at the door of America's classrooms, knocking once, and now.

James H. Hanscom is Instructor in Social Studies at New York University.

EDUCATION IN THE REHABILITATION OF MALADJUSTED PERSONALITIES

W. B. Brookover

During the recent war the medical departments of the Army and Navy instituted extensive programs of physical reconditioning, occupational therapy, and education which were designed to speed the recovery of the men and return them to active duty at the highest possible level of physical and mental fitness. The writer was one of several naval officers assigned to hospitals in late 1943 to inaugurate an experimental educational program as a part of the total scheme of rehabilitation.¹ The officers in charge instituted the Navy educational program as an experiment, but since there was at that time little opportunity to establish any control over the rehabilitation situation, the experiments consisted of little more than demonstrating to the satisfaction of hospital administrators that such a program was desirable. Continuation and extension of the program is testimony to the success of this sales campaign, but there is little reliable evidence of the effectiveness of the experiment in modifying the lives of the patients. Since large sums of money and much effort have been and are being expended for the rehabilitation of servicemen and others through educational activities, it seems desirable to examine briefly (1) the reasons for its development, (2) the extent of its effectiveness, and (3) the theoretical foundation for such a program.

I

Between the two wars the concept of rehabilitation had a very limited reference. It referred primarily to the occupational re-estab-

¹ The Army Air Forces had instituted a convalescent training program somewhat earlier, but it did not emphasize a general educational program as did the Navy. A description of the military rehabilitation programs can be found in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXXIV (May 1945); see Howard Rusk and Eugene Taylor, "Army Air Forces Convalescent Training Program," pp. 55-59; Walter B. Bingham, "The Climbing Soldier, The Army Program for Rehabilitating Casualties," pp. 60-65; and George C. Mann, "The Navy Rehabilitation Program," pp. 66ff.

lishment of physically disabled persons but was not concerned with the readjustment of the mentally disturbed.² The techniques of rehabilitation during this period were largely limited to physical and occupational therapy, vocational training, and the fitting of mechanical aids. There was limited use of education, occupational therapy, recreation, and group therapy in institutions concerned with the rehabilitation of maladjusted persons prior to the Second World War, but these hospital and reformatory activities were rarely known as rehabilitation. Furthermore, education was probably the least common type of therapy in such institutions. The rehabilitation programs developed during the war in military hospitals, convalescent centers, and prisons, however, included, in addition to the above, other services such as group therapy, physical training, work assignments, vocational and educational counseling as well as the traditional therapeutic services.³ The current conception of rehabilitation includes any program designed to return any physically, personally, or socially maladjusted person to normal activity in society. In this paper we are concerned with those whose behavior is considered unacceptable, either because it is neurotic, psychotic, or delinquent. Such persons we have called maladjusted personalities.

The motivation for the wartime development of rehabilitation programs came largely from two sources. First of all, there was a great need for man power, and any method suggested to conserve military personnel and maintain efficiency was favorably regarded. Second, there was a strong expression of public opinion that every effort should be made to prevent and overcome handicaps that might result from disabilities acquired while in the service. This pressure was more effective because of competition which developed between the services. Since the Army Air Forces was least ossi-

² Oscar M. Sullivan, "Rehabilitation," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, XIII, 1944, 221-24.

³ See *The Rehabilitation Program of the Medical Department of the U. S. Navy* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office) and Joseph Abramson and Lloyd McCorkle, "Group Psychotherapy of Military Offenders," *American Journal of Sociology*, LI (March 1946), 455-64, as well as *The Annals*, loc. cit.

fied in the caste of military custom, it was the first to develop a reconditioning program. Traditional rivalry and public acclaim for the Army Air Forces program stimulated the Navy, Marine Corps, and Army Ground Forces to attempt to outdo the younger service.

The program which developed, although quite extensive, was hurriedly conceived. Lack of time and scientific research in the field made it necessary to adapt any activity that seemed desirable on an *a priori* basis to the needs of rehabilitation. The general belief in our culture that education is good for anybody at any time assured its acceptance as a legitimate part of a rehabilitation program.

II

In spite of its acceptance by military-hospital administrators and the interested public, there is little scientific evidence to support the believed effectiveness of education or other specific aspects of current rehabilitation programs. Comparisons with First World War recoveries suggest that rehabilitation activities have been effective in returning a larger proportion of physical and neuropsychiatric servicemen to duty. The factor control is so inadequate in such comparison, however, that the validity of such evidence is questionable. Objective evidence of the recovery of some physical abilities can be obtained and a few studies of the effectiveness of specific psychotherapy techniques have been reported.⁴ However, there is a notable absence of carefully controlled experiments on the effect of the widely accepted rehabilitation activities on maladjusted personalities. They are believed to be effective, but in what cases or under what conditions is unknown. This is particularly true of education, with which we are concerned.⁵

⁴ See S. R. Slavson, *An Introduction to Group Therapy* (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1943); Abramson and McCorkle, *loc. cit.*; Mildred Paperte, "Music in Military Medicine," *Mental Hygiene*, XXX (January 1946), 56-64; and Harry L. Freedman, "The Mental Hygiene Unit Approach to Reconditioning Neuropsychiatric Casualties," *Mental Hygiene*, XXIX (April 1945), no. 2.

⁵ The study by Freedman, *loc. cit.*, gives more evidence of the effectiveness of education than any other, but his emphasis is primarily on the group mental-hygiene approach.

Schnurr's study of the parole success of prisoners who had participated in an educational program is perhaps the best study of results in this field and is suggestive of further possible research, but the controls which he was able to achieve in using historical data are not entirely satisfactory.⁶

III

Since there is little valid research evidence upon which to base a program of educational rehabilitation, one might expect to find a generally accepted theoretical framework as the foundation for it. However, there has been little inclination to justify expenditure of time and effort on the rehabilitation of the maladjusted by any theory of personality development or readjustment.⁷ A few statements concerned with the relation between educational activities and readjustment in society have been expressed. The most commonly verbalized concept is the one that it is a good thing to keep neuropsychiatric patients or prisoners *busy*. It is difficult to know what is meant by this, but it apparently assumes that the old saw, "An idle mind is the devil's workshop," has some validity. Of course, associated with this is the belief that education is "good" and, therefore, as beneficial a way to keep busy as any. At least one psychiatrist of the writer's acquaintance took issue with this theory when applied to fatigue and anxiety cases. He felt that what they needed was idleness and rest rather than either mental or physical activity.

Freedman suggests a more specific relationship when discussing activity or interest groups organized around interests in learning automobile mechanics, electricity, and other fields of knowledge.⁸ He says, "It is around such interests that the soldier is able to work through his problem without the possible unproductive results in-

⁶ Alfred Schnurr, Unpublished MSS, read before the American Sociology Society, Cleveland, March 1946.

⁷ Abramson and McCorkle, *loc. cit.*, apparently assume a theory of a personality readjustment, but do not discuss it as such.

⁸ Harry L. Freedman, *loc. cit.*

volved in discussing unconscious or deep personality material or feeling...." A similar concept is expressed by Davis without specific reference to educational activities.⁹

A more complete formulation of a theory of the effect of the group in the rehabilitation of the maladjusted has been made by Slavson.¹⁰ He does not, however, develop a basic theory of personality readjustment. It should be recognized though that many of Slavson's observations on group therapy are applicable to educational rehabilitation as well, for the latter is based on group interaction.

Each of the above, no doubt, has a contribution to make to a theory of personality rehabilitation, but their contributions are not systematic expressions of such a theory. Much more effective results could probably be obtained if a program were planned in terms of an integrated theory of personality adjustment. Such a theory should, at the same time, provide the hypotheses to be tested in experimental situations. Since education has become an established part of military rehabilitation programs, its continuation and extension to other agencies dealing with maladjusted persons can be expected. It would seem desirable at this time, therefore, to suggest a theory of personality rehabilitation as a basis for research which must be made before valid generalizations concerning the effectiveness of educational rehabilitation can be made.

The basic concept in such a theory should be the generally accepted social-psychological hypothesis that *human personality develops in the experience of the individual as the biological organism interacts with human beings within the social-cultural environment*. The corollary of this theory as applied to the neuropsychiatric, criminal, or otherwise maladjusted human beings may be stated: *The unaccepted behavior of the maladjusted person is [also] the result of the individual's experience in the same interactive proc-*

⁹ John E. Davis, "An Introduction to the Problem of Rehabilitation," *Mental Hygiene*, XXIX (April 1945), 217-30.

¹⁰ S. R. Slavson, *op. cit.*, ch. 1.

ess. If this concept is valid, it should follow that *human behavior of maladjusted persons can be modified by a modification of experience through the control of their social-cultural environment.*

The concept of rehabilitation assumes the possibility of modification of behavior patterns, but this has been sought primarily through efforts to change the person's reaction to the social-cultural situation without providing new experiences upon which to base such new behavior. The need for the individual to modify the internalized patterns of hostility, anxiety, or other reactive types is readily recognized, but it seems too much to expect unless new attitudes, roles, and habits are developed with which he can function in the group without constant frustration.

That portion of the therapeutic social-cultural milieu which is designed to develop these new attitudes, roles, and habits is essentially educational in nature. However, an educational program will produce slight results if it continues to be based on the substantive, dualistic concept of mind and personality which has dominated our educational psychology in the past. Much psychotherapy and reform practice is also based on the concept that the mind is a distinct organ or facility which stores up ideas that have been taught or presented to it and, in turn, directs or initiates behavior. Related to this is the concept that the will is an unexplained source of control which enables the individual to direct behavior without reference to experience.

The theory of rehabilitation stated above assumes that mind is a development of and product of social interaction and emerges from the individual's ability to take the attitude of the other and use that attitude for the control of his own conduct.¹¹ Thus the individual's ability to control his own conduct results from the internalization of the attitudes of the people with whom he interacts and the will

¹¹ See George H. Mead, *Mind, Self and Society* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934), pp. 186 ff.

is a complex of habitual patterns of response to various social situations.¹⁷

Education as a process of rehabilitation is not then merely a process of keeping the maladjusted person "busy." Neither is it merely suggesting new ideas to him which his mind may use to change behavior. If it is to function in this capacity, the educational milieu must provide the opportunity for the maladjusted person to participate in a social group in such a way that he will internalize attitudes which lead to acceptable behavior, participate in groups where he can take acceptable roles within the group, and acquire habits of behavior that perpetuate and fix the acceptable roles. Mead's concept of the "generalized other" suggests that the common elements of the various roles become internalized in a general role that society expects the person to take.¹⁸ The behavior of maladjusted persons may thus be the result of a distorted internalization of the group's concept of his role or of the internalization of roles that are not accepted in his present society. If this is the case, participation in groups where the individual takes roles that are generally acceptable in society will lead to the internalization of a new set of generalized attitudes. These new attitudes which the maladjusted person develops in interaction with the group become the basis upon which he can control his own behavior in terms of what society expects of him.

The techniques of educational rehabilitation then involve: first, the construction of a group situation in which the maladjusted person is presented roles or behavior patterns which are both acceptable to the group and satisfying to him. Second, this group situation must be constructed in such a way that it presents a minimum and decreasing opportunity for the maladjusted person to interact in terms of the unaccepted roles and attitudes. And, third, the individual must be observed to determine if he participates in the group

¹⁷ See John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct* (New York: Henry Holt and Company Inc., 1922).

¹⁸ Mead, *loc. cit.*

in such a way and for a long enough period to internalize and make habitual the accepted roles and attitudes.

The design of the groups in which various types of maladjusted persons are most effectively rehabilitated must be determined by careful experimental research. There is little evidence of work of this sort but some suggestions may be made. The work of the army rehabilitation centers with court-martialed men is a technique at least similar to the one indicated.¹⁴ There have been a variety of other group-therapy projects that involve some of the theory outlined above. However, most of these groups have been devoted to a discussion, in one form or another, of the various adjustment problems of the individuals. The activity groups described by Slavson are exceptions.¹⁵ Such groups are indicative of the part which the development of new roles in a group may play in the readjustment process. As indicated by Freedman, group activity would probably be more effective if the group were organized around some educational or vocational interest.¹⁶ In such groups the individual would be learning new skills or acquiring new knowledge which would provide the basis for new roles and status in society in general. This should be a more reliable basis for readjustment than mere group participation where the activity is of no value in the individual's drive for status or success. Constant precautions would be necessary to prevent such groups from functioning only in the traditional educational sense as a means of storing new ideas in the mind rather than providing the social interaction necessary for the development of acceptable roles and attitudes. Intimate groups organized around such interests as a sport, a particular field of knowledge, a vocational skill, or any other activity where close group relationships and constant participation were possible would seem most likely to provide the experience necessary.

Obviously the validity of the theoretical framework presented

¹⁴ See Abramson and McCorkle, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵ S. R. Slavson, *loc. cit.*

¹⁶ Freedman, *loc. cit.*

here must be determined by careful examination of the results with all types of maladjusted persons in a variety of rehabilitation or readjustment situations. Although the emphasis made here on education as a process of social interaction may vary considerably from the traditional concept of the teacher putting ideas in the mind of the student, this concept must be recognized as the basis of any educational process, including rehabilitation, if we accept the assumption that mind and personality are social emergents. Furthermore my limited experience in the use of semitradeional educational techniques in informal group situations has indicated that readjustment is facilitated by such experience. Many case histories of patients and the testimony of psychiatrists suggest the effectiveness of military educational-rehabilitation programs. There is also some evidence of success in penal reform programs.³⁷ However, carefully controlled experiments in the rehabilitation of the maladjusted through educational activities of the type suggested here have not been made. Definite conclusions concerning the effectiveness of such a rehabilitation education must await such studies. The current public interest in rehabilitation and the precedents that have been established by experimental rehabilitation programs in military activities and civilian agencies set the stage for the inauguration of such studies. Sound comprehensive programs will develop only when the results of research based on an adequate theory of personality readjustment are available. It is not inconceivable that such research would provide additional insight into the nature of human personality and influence our educational theory as well as point the way for the rehabilitation of maladjusted personalities.

³⁷ See Alfred Schnurr, *loc. cit.*, and Carl Johnson, "An Adult Education Program for Prisoners," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, September 1940.

W. B. Brookover is on the staff of the Department of Social Science, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan.

A PROTOCOL FOR AN EFFECTIVE DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION

S. E. Frost, Jr.

Wars kill men, women, and children and destroy property, but they do not root up ideas. Nothing should be more obvious than this fact to those who have lived through two world wars, both fought, we were told, to eliminate one pattern of ideas and enthrone another. Wars hew off one head of the dragon. Peace is the time when two heads grow from the bloody stump.

Any educator who stops long enough to recall what he learned, or should have learned, in elementary educational psychology, will realize that force is a highly ineffective method of teaching. Learning comes by way of experience and force very often results in blocking the idea desired and making fertile the mind for just the opposite idea.

Moreover, education is far more than just telling. Education is a matter of the whole individual in, and interacting with, a total environment. To educate efficiently, the individual and all phases of the environment must be understood. When antagonistic factors operate in the environment or the factors of the environment are not suited to the nature of the individual, education is, to say the least, inefficient. Often the results are the opposite of those intended.

These facts and their implications set the pattern for an effective democratic education throughout the world. Only as educators take them as guides can we hope to bring peace out of strife and a democratic world out of slavery.

The hope of the world lies in education.

There are certain things that this *does not mean*. First, education does not mean writing books, establishing places of learning, and telling young people about the democratic way of life. Too often a teacher has despaired because the out-of-school environment ne-

gates all that the school attempts to do. The teacher tells the child that honesty is the best policy and the class reads essays and stories written to emphasize this point. Then the child goes home to hear how his father made a nice profit in a "shady" deal. He sees all about him dishonesty leading to success and is told that this is "good business."

Second, education does not mean force and discipline. We may set penalties for failure to conform to the established code and may make public examples of violators. This but acts as a stimulant for clever minds to find a way of avoiding the penalty while gaining the reward. The black market is our most recent evidence on this point. Might may destroy a few individuals, but it does not destroy ideas.

Democracy is the privilege of intelligent men and women. Where individuals are ignorant, selfish, narrow, present-minded, democracy is the greatest of evils. It becomes the technique by which the mass makes dominant its weaknesses and pulls down to its level those who would destroy the evil. It makes possible self-seeking leaders who fill the masses with lies, and through lies hold them in slavery.

Education for democracy must be education of the whole man, but it must be education by example. Ideas are caught more often than they are taught.

We have come through the most devastating war of all history to military victory over our enemies. We have shown our might. For the present we hold in our hands the most destructive weapon of all times, the atomic bomb. We can dominate the world by force. It would be possible for us to drop a dozen atomic bombs at strategic points on the globe and then issue a call for a gathering of representatives from all nations in Washington. Any hesitation could be eliminated by one or two more bombs. At this convention we could say, "Gentlemen, we want no more war. Here is what you must do to make war impossible. Destroy immediately all warmaking agen-

cies in your countries. Here is the pattern of the world of tomorrow. Follow it in detail. We shall police the world from now on. Any deviation from this pattern will be punishable by death."

This policy would establish a Pax Americana. It would not eliminate war forever. Sooner or later the shrewdness of man would circumvent the plan, gain control of the atomic bomb and the other forces for keeping the peace, and war would burst upon the world again.

We must change the world by demonstrating to the world that democracy works better than any other form of human living. We must spread ideas of democracy through all the agencies known to mankind, but most of all through example. As long as our house is in disorder our actions will speak so loudly that others cannot hear what we say.

To make education for democracy there are many things we must do. First, we must restore integrity to our government. There are multitudes in the United States today who can no longer trust those in authority in the Federal Government. They have been lied to by those elected to positions of trust. They have seen members of the highest governing bodies of the country putting politics above the public good. They have lost faith in the democratic way.

Second, we must call great men to high office. Honest leadership is lacking today as it has seldom been in American history. Weakness and vacillation rule where there should be certainty and vision. The people must demand leadership and must refuse to follow party bosses and self-seeking groups any longer.

Third, we must create within men a clean heart. There is no place for selfishness in a democracy. No longer can we take as our motto, "What is best for me?" Rather we must write in the hearts of all, "What is best for mankind?" The individual must be willing to sacrifice himself in peace with the same abandon and high purpose that he sacrifices in war.

Fourth, we must become one people. Today we have lost our

sense of oneness and are many people pulling against each other for individual gain. Athens fell when individualism became dominant. Unless we stem the tide of modern individualism, America will fall and become but a page in human history, a page that starts with great hope but ends in despair.

Until we do this, all the education of the schools will be as nothing in the world. We may spend millions printing books, building schools, supporting teachers who give brilliant lectures, but we will fail until we can say to the world, "Look! In America democracy works." This one statement will be more educative than all the books, all the schools, and all the teachers in the world. This way lies efficient education for democracy.

S. E. Frost, Jr., is Assistant Professor of Education at Brooklyn College.

JUDICIAL ATTITUDES TOWARD COLORED MINORITIES AND EDUCATION

J. Hartt Walsh

The Federal Constitution and Minority Rights

Politically oppressed minorities have significantly shaped the development of the United States. Since its inception this nation has been the refuge of the oppressed trying to escape political tyrants and bigots in Europe. Many were attracted to the new country because here was room: room for imagination, room for living, room for self-expression, room for development according to one's talents and energy with few of the old restrictions and inhibitions. Everyone was on his own.

Most of the later as well as the earlier migrations are traceable to political and religious oppression of small groups. It is true that economic and social considerations frequently were important determinants in compelling emigrants to leave their homelands; these were secondary, however. Political domination of the many by the few rather than social and economic differences seems to have been the genesis of the treks to the new world. Within the United States the oppression of large minority groups over a long period of time has often been dictated by social differences of race rather than by political factors.

In the Preamble to the Constitution the Founding Fathers declared that one principal purpose in the establishment of the new country and in the writing of the new Constitution was to "promote the general welfare." In the course of the early framing of the Constitution and in its later evolution, the authors of the Constitution revealed an evident concern for, and a verbal interest in, the rights of minorities. The regulation of affairs with the Indian tribes, for example, was not to be left to the caprice or whims of local and

state authorities, but was lodged with the Federal Government.¹ The delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 declared that colored persons might be imported or moved from place to place without restrictions by the Congress, only until 1802.² Later amendments declared that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction,"³ and that "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."⁴ Although the reference obviously was made to Negroes, since it was the Negro slave problem which prompted the amendments, the word "Negro" is everywhere omitted in the Constitution. Only "race" and "color" are used. This fact has since led the federal courts to so interpret the Constitution as to include members of the yellow race as "colored."⁵

The sanctity of the general principle of minority rights is rooted in our historical past. This nation had its birth in a revolution resulting from the imposition of restrictions and the deprivation of rights and privileges which the colonists, a British colonial minority, were forced to endure. Despite this background and national origin, after we assumed statehood, various minority groups have been the objects of social pressure and governmental action. The red man, the Negro, and the "yellow man" have all been targets of certain legislation and/or action promulgated to correct conditions resulting from feelings of racial antipathy or superiority. The Indian lost his lands; the Negro was deprived of his right of suffrage and of equality (and in a large measure never regained them); the Oriental has been barred from American shores through the Exclusion Act. One should observe, however, that other individuals and

¹ *Constitution of the United States*, Art. 1, sec. 8, par. 3.

² *Ibid.*, Art. 1, sec. 9, par. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, Amend. XIII.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Amend. XV.

⁵ *Gong Lum v. Rice*, 275 U. S. 78, 72 L. Ed. 172. Mississippi, 1927.

groups besides definitive racial elements have been exploited and disadvantaged.

Early Attitudes of the Judiciary

In decisions handed down by the courts over the years, and relevant to phases of education, the judges have revealed an admixture of socio-educational thinking. In some instances, the jurists have adhered to legal and technical, rule-of-thumb interpretations; in other cases they seem to have been governed by traditionally paternalistic ideals of justice. More recently there has been evidence to indicate that they have been motivated by a desire to achieve socially desirable ends, and to try to reconcile individual rights and privileges with the larger social good.

The case of *Hall v. DeCuir* is interesting because, while it deals at length with certain phases of education, the litigation actually arose over the question of the constitutional rights of one of the Southern states to regulate river traffic.⁹ In 1877 the Supreme Court declared an act of the Louisiana legislature "unconstitutional and void" because it proposed "... to give all persons travelling within that state, upon vessels. . . . engaged in the transportation of passengers among states, equal rights and privileges in all parts of the vessel without distinction on account of race or color." The master of the vessel was not permitted to exclude colored persons from a cabin which he had set aside for white passengers. The court held the act to be unconstitutional because it was a regulation of interstate commerce, and therefore outside the province of the state of Louisiana so to regulate.

In partial support of its decision the court cited several instances of cases arising as a result of the maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children. Ohio school boards:

.... were authorized to establish within their respective jurisdictions one or more separate schools. . . . Colored children were not admitted as a

⁹ *Hall v. De Cuir*, 95 U. S. 485, 24 L. Ed. 547. Louisiana, 1877.

matter of right into the schools for white children . . . ; equality of rights does not involve the necessity of educating white and colored persons in the same school any more than it does that of educating children of both sexes in the same school, or that different grades of scholars must be kept in the same school Any classification which preserves equal school advantages is not prohibited by . . . the Federal Constitution.

Separate primary schools were maintained in the city of Boston. Children [who were] unlawfully excluded from public school instruction [might] recover damages therefor. . . .

A Negro child was excluded and brought suit for damages. The child's "counsel insisted that the separation tended to deepen and perpetuate the odious distinction of caste." The court apparently did not answer this contention but asserted that it came to its conclusion in disallowing the claim, "on just grounds of reason and experience, and in the results of a discriminating and honest judgment."

"Age and sex have always been marks of classification in public schools throughout the history of our country. . . .," continued the high court. The justice writing the decision in the *De Cuir* case then pointed out that in Nevada any system of classification might be used "whether based on sex, age, race, or any other reasonable existent condition."

School privileges are usually conferred by statute, and as such, are subject to such regulations as the legislature may prescribe. Such statutes generally provide for equal school advantages for all children, classifying the scholars as the legislature in its wisdom may direct or authorize. . . . It is settled law . . . that the board may assign a particular school for colored children, and exclude them from schools assigned for white children, and that such regulation is not in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In another case the United States Circuit Court for Ohio concurred with the State Supreme Court and declared, in 1882, that it was not unconstitutional to maintain separate schools for colored children.⁷ In this instance the school for white children was three

⁷ *United States v. Buntin*, 10 F. 730. Ohio, 1882. See also *Hall v. De Cuir*, 93 U. S. 485, 24 L. Ed. 547. Louisiana, 1877.

miles from the home of the colored boys, while the colored school was five miles distant. The circuit judge asserted that "if there was a school for colored children they should have gone there, and the defendant did him no wrong in the exclusion," i.e., of the colored children from the school for white children. The judge did opine, however, that if the distance was so great that they were placed at a great disadvantage, they should have been admitted to the school for whites. The judge did not define great distance, however—evidently five miles was not too great. A year later, however, another federal circuit court declared that any act allowing discrimination between whites and blacks in the distribution of the school fund was void.⁸

The maintenance of separate schools and of equal educational opportunities for colored adolescents was disregarded by the United States Supreme Court just before the turn of the century. After maintaining a high school for Negroes for seventeen years, the Board of Education for Richmond County, Georgia, in July 1897, voted to close the Negro school upon the advice of a special investigating committee for "purely economic reasons," whereupon an injunction was sought in the superior court of Richmond County to restrain the board from maintaining a high school for white children without also maintaining one for colored children.⁹

The school board averred that "400 or more Negro children were being turned away from the primary grades" annually because the board was unable to provide them "with seats or teachers." It also declared that the same building and means used to educate the Negro boys and girls in Ware High School "would accommodate 200 pupils in the rudiments of education." In addition the board opined that it was unable financially to erect buildings and employ more teachers; it must be, in effect, either 60 pupils in high school

⁸ *Claybrook et al. v. City of Owensboro*, 23 F. 634. Kentucky 1883 and 1884.

⁹ *Cumming v. Board of Education of Richmond County*, 175 U. S. 523, 44 L. Ed. 262. Georgia, 1899.

and 400 without even primary training, or 200 with and 200 without primary training, and no high school.

The reasoning of Mr. Justice Harlan is curious and interesting:

The substantial relief asked is an injunction that would either impair the efficiency of the high school provided for white children or compel the board to close it. But if that were done, the result would only be to take from white children educational privileges enjoyed by them, without giving to colored children additional opportunities for the education furnished in high schools.

He made no statement concerning the fact that the board had taken from the colored children the high-school privileges which they had enjoyed from 1880 to 1897. Any group is disadvantaged and discriminated against if the *status quo* of the group is maintained while another is being advanced. Surely no advantages would accrue to the one by taking away from the other, but, as in the case being considered, it seems reasonable to conclude that since the colored population had lost its high school in 1897, an equal loss by the white people in 1899 would be no more severe since the board stated it was financially unable to provide an equal and adequate education, i.e., from primary school through high school, for all.

The practice of maintaining separate schools for white and colored children was raised before the Supreme Court in the *Cumming* case,³⁰ but since it had not been included in the pleadings before the lower court, Justice Harlan refused to consider it. He pointed out that the court was "not permitted by the evidence in the record" to determine whether the board's decision was "made with any desire or purpose. . . to discriminate against any of the colored school children of the county on account of their race." Here again we have an instance of the court evidencing a reliance on legal mechanics and a strict and stereotyped construction and interpretation of the Constitution. Instead of positively asserting its "notions

³⁰ *Cumming v. County Board of Education of Richmond County*, 175 U. S. 528, 44 L. Ed. 262, Georgia, 1899.

of sound and desirable social policy"¹¹ in the case before it, the court passively declared it was "not permitted by the evidence" formally presented to delve into the socio-educational elements of the case. Instead, the court suggested "some [other] appropriate proceedings" to mitigate the discriminatory actions of the school board. The court naïvely admitted the presence of the problems, but tacitly refused to project its own conception of the intent of the law, and what was reasonable, into the decision.

Thirty-two years later the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for Oklahoma accepted the decision in the Cumming case and referred to it.¹² The court asserted that "even a suspension of a separate school, for economic reasons under some conditions, may be justified."

Previously, the colored school was the district school while the white school was the separate school. Under the Oklahoma Statutes:

.... the county separate school in each district is the school in said school district of the race having the fewest numbers of children in said school district. Members of the district school board shall be of the same race as the children who are entitled to attend the school of the district not the separate school.

Hence a change in the designation of the respective schools carried with it complete control over *all* schools, district and separate, by the race whose school was, in effect, the designated district school.

The records of the case do not reconcile the apparent contradiction of a "greater number of pupils" for the colored separate school with the number in attendance at the white district school. The statutes declared that the separate school shall be "the school of the race having the fewest number of children." Evidently what the court meant to say or should have said, if true, was that the separate school building and facilities were inadequate for the num-

¹¹ *Pease v. Sinclair Refining Company*, 104 F. 2d. 183. New York, 1939.

¹² *School District No. 7 Muskogee County, Oklahoma et al. v. Hunnicutt, County Superintendent*, 51 F. 2d. 528. Oklahoma, 1931.

ber of colored children eligible to use them, and that the total number of colored pupils in the district was presumably smaller than the total number of white children in the district.

The court pointed out that the state constitution prevented any abuse of power by the county superintendent, and that it also provided for "like accommodations to be impartially maintained." Another section of the Oklahoma constitution, in the words of the court, provided for "separate schools for white and colored children" which "shall be maintained with impartial facilities for both races." The court held that "in the control of the schools" the county superintendent "was required to conform" to the provisions of the constitution, and "it was his duty if he sought to change the status of the schools to secure the objects of the state constitution and statute."

The court was of the opinion that the "plaintiffs did not pursue the remedy open to them," namely, a "mandamus action to compel an additional levy of taxes" by the excise board to meet the needs of the colored separate school "with its greater number of pupils." "If we assume," continued the court, "there was the alleged disparity in funds, it did not arise from the inter-change of schools." A court might draw that hypothetical conclusion, but the facts of case as stated by the court, and the provisions of the statute, that the "district school board shall be of the same race as the children [of the] district . . . school" makes it possible for disparities to exist even though the Constitution avers *none should exist*. And the court's statement, based on an earlier United States Supreme Court decision, that "even a suspension of a separate school," but not the district school, "for economic reasons under some conditions, may be justified," seems to be a contradiction of the clause in the Oklahoma state constitution of "impartial facilities for both races," and a recognition on the part of the court of those democratic anachronisms which the courts have called "justifiable inequalities."

Recent Rulings of the Courts

In contrast to most earlier opinions dealing with problems involving racial differentiation, a circuit court of appeals in 1940 declared the Alston case¹⁸ to be "as clear a discrimination on the ground of race as could well be imagined." The court, after reading the evidence, was constrained to remark, "That an unconstitutional discrimination is set forth in these paragraphs, hardly admits of argument."

Alston, a Negro schoolteacher in Norfolk, Virginia, and the Norfolk Negro Teachers Association, brought suit against the school board and the city superintendent to compel a change in the Norfolk teachers' salary schedule which had fixed a lower rate for Negro teachers who had the same training, experience, qualifications, and certification as the white teachers.

The court cited the fact that:

.... while provision is made in the law for separate schools for white and colored persons, the positive duty is enjoined of maintaining these separate schools under the same general regulations as to management, usefulness, and efficiency. The allegations of the complaint as to discrimination which must be taken as true are as follows: "Defendants over a long period of years have consistently pursued and maintained and are now pursuing and maintaining the policy, custom, and usage of paying Negro teachers and principals in said public school system less salary than the white teachers and principals possessing the same professional qualifications, certificates and experience, and exercising the same duties and performing the same services as Negro teachers and principals. Such discrimination is being practiced and is based solely upon race and color."

Such a naked discrimination on the basis of race alone "falls

¹⁸ *Alston v. School Board of City of Norfolk*, 112 F. 2d. 992. Virginia, 1940. See also *Thomas v. Hibbitts et al.*, 46 F. Supp. 368, Tennessee, 1942. *Mills v. Board of Education of Anne Arundel County*, 30 F. Supp. 245, Maryland, 1939. *Thompson v. Gibbs*, 60 F. Supp. 872. D. C. 1945.

squarely within the inhibition of both the due process, and equal protection clauses of the 14th Amendment."

Although Judge Parker was evidently confident that the court had before it a clear-cut case of racial discrimination in violation of the Constitution, he reinforced his opinion for the court with the statements drawn from both state and federal Supreme Court decisions.¹⁴

As was said by Mr. Justice Harlan . . . "the Constitution of the United States, in its present form, forbids, so far as civil and political rights are concerned, discrimination by the general government, as by the states, against any citizen because of his race. All citizens are equal before the law. The guarantees of life, liberty, and property are for all persons, within the jurisdiction of the United States, or of any state, without discrimination against any because of their race. Those guarantees, when their violation is properly presented . . . must be enforced in the Courts, both of the nation and of the state without reference to considerations based upon race."

In a case similar to the Alston litigation here considered, Judge Chestnut, quoted by Judge Parker, declared:

While the state may freely select its employees and determine their compensation it would, in my opinion, be clearly unconstitutional for a state to pass legislation which imposed discriminatory burdens on the colored race with respect to qualifications for office or prescribe a rate of pay less than that for other classes solely on account of race or color. If therefore, the state laws prescribed that colored teachers of equal qualifications with white teachers should receive less compensation on account of the color, such law would clearly be unconstitutional.

Conclusions

Two facts seem to unfold as one studies the opinions handed down in the federal courts. Contrary to the opinion held in some quarters, judges and justices seem to be relying less upon legal techniques and mechanics than upon their own role as social phi-

¹⁴ *Alston v. School Board of City of Norfolk*, 112 F. 2d. 992. Virginia, 1940.

losophers. Cleavages between judges and justices now seem to occur within a framework of general agreement on fundamental principles of social philosophy and justice.

Public education is the very cornerstone of American democracy. The public schools must provide equal educational opportunities for all American citizens regardless of race, color, or creed. Since the federal jurists are the final interpreters and arbiters of the rights and privileges guaranteed to all citizens of the United States by the Constitution, it is vitally important that their legal philosophy and interpretations take cognizance of current social and educational problems, and that they "adapt [their] legal forms and . . . judicial interpretations to the actual present national needs of the largest progressive democracy in the modern world."¹⁵

¹⁵ Quoted from an address by Chief Justice John Marshall.

J. Hartt Walsh is Associate Professor of Education at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION IN THE U.S.S.R.

Salomon M. Teitelbaum

Progressive education was little known in Russia before the November Revolution. Under the czarist regime, almost unlimited parental authority was exercised in all classes of the population except for a thin layer of the intelligentsia. Among the large masses of the people, particularly the peasantry, which constituted about 75 per cent of the population before 1917, flogging of children was widespread and children were bound to obey their parents blindly. A strict discipline prevailed in the schools, and relations between teachers and pupils were cold and formal. Consequently, progressive education—in Russia, known as “free education”—had an insignificant following before the revolution.

One might say that the father of progressive education in Russia was Lev Tolstoy. In his pedagogical articles, written in the early 1860's, the great Russian writer emphasizes the difference between education and culture. He contends that “education is the tendency of one man to make another just like himself” and adds that he is convinced that the educator undertakes with such zeal the education of the child because at the base of this tendency lies his envy of the child's purity, and his desire to make him like himself, that is, to spoil him. Tolstoy asserts that “education as a premeditated formation of men according to certain patterns is *sterile, unlawful, and impossible*. . . . There are no rights of education . . . nor have they been acknowledged nor will they ever be by the young generation under education, which always and everywhere is set against compulsion in education.”¹ Education is a moral despotism practiced against children. In Tolstoy's opinion, the school must have one aim only: the transmission of information, of knowledge, without attempting to pass over into the moral territory of convictions, beliefs, and characters.

¹ Lev N. Tolstoy, *Pedagogical Articles* (trans. by Leo Wiener) (New York: Willey Book Company, 1904), pp. 111–12.

Relations between teachers and pupils must be based on equality; the pupil should be able to choose what he wishes to learn.

In his school at Yasnaya Polyana, Tolstoy tried to put his educational ideas into practice. The peasants' children who visited the school were quite free. There was no discipline; there were no lessons, no books. The children were not even required to remember anything of the lessons they had done the day before. No child was ever rebuked for tardiness.

Among the Russian educators the most outstanding supporter of progressive education was Konstantin N. Wentzel. Born in 1857, he published many books and pamphlets both before and after the revolution, in which he advocated the doctrine of free education with fervor and enthusiasm. The most representative of Wentzel's books is *The Theory of Free Education and the Ideal Kindergarten*. The fourth, revised and completed, edition of this book was published in 1923 and included the famous "Declaration of the Rights of the Child."²

Wentzel's Theory of Free Education

Wentzel assumes that the theory of progressive education is a logical deduction from the ideas developed by such educators as Montaigne, Comenius, Pestalozzi, Rousseau, Froebel, and many others. Progressive education is a reaction against violation of the child's personality, a violation which was and is practiced everywhere, in all countries of the world and in all classes of society. In Wentzel's opinion, the child was nowhere considered as a person in his own right, but rather as a means. Parents and educators, regardless of the political regime, endeavored always to bring up the child according to their political and social ideas. The Russian educator contends that it is time to understand that "a child is neither the property of his parents and educators, nor an object, a doll or a toy,

²Other books by Konstantin N. Wentzel are: *The Struggle for a Free School*, *The Liberation of the Child*, *New Ways in the Education and Formation of Children*, *Invisible Bonds of Slavery*.

with which one can do whatever one likes and which one can dispose of as one pleases." Wentzel contends that the time has come to understand that neither is the child an inanimate block of marble, nor the educator a sculptor who, by means of hammer and chisel, ruthlessly cuts, carves, and chips the marble.

The greatest mistake of educators is that they consider education from the intellectual angle only. Wentzel quotes Henri Bergson in order to prove that the intellect may be an excellent tool when dealing with inanimate objects, but becomes impotent when it has to deal with a living being.³ Wentzel calls progressive education "free education" because its slogan is the liberation of the creative forces of the child and the development of his personality.⁴

The best method for achieving this purpose is free work and the creation of a labor "educational community" and participation in its life. In Wentzel's opinion, the labor educational community must even replace the obsolete school. The most important problem of free education is the development of will. This can best be achieved through socially useful work, free games, and free association with children of the same age and with adults. The intellectual part of the education must be based on research work voluntarily performed by the child.

The fundamental principles of free education were stated in the famous "Declaration of the Rights of the Child." The declaration consists of 18 sections and an introduction.⁵

Section 4 grants to the child the right to select and to dismiss his educators: "Every child has the right to choose his educators and to repudiate and leave his parents if they are bad educators. This right to abandon his parents belongs to the child at any age, and the State and society must see to it that any changes in this direction shall

³ Konstantin N. Wentzel, [*Theory of Free Education and the Ideal Kindergarten*] (4th rev. and completed ed.; Petersburg-Moscow, 1923), pp. 5-10. [In Russian.]

⁴ Because the term "free education" is generally accepted in Russian pedagogic literature, it is being used throughout this article.

⁵ Wentzel, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-93.

not entail deterioration of the material condition of the child's life."

Section 8 proclaims that the child has equal rights with the adult: "A child at any age has equal rights and equal liberty with any adult."

Section 18 forbids punishment of a child: "No punishment may be inflicted upon a child."

The most interesting part of the Declaration, however, is the introduction, which is written with fervor and pathos:

Up to the present time, in all civilized countries of the world, the child . . . has been an oppressed being.

Besides other kinds of enslavement and social inequality, there exists also the enslavement and inequality resulting from the difference in age. All mankind is divided into two large groups: adults—the older generation—and minors—children, the younger generation. The former, i.e., the older generation, is the master of, and keeps in his power, the second generation, i.e., the children. An end must be put to this. The older generation, if it is conscious of its responsibility to coming generations, should of its own accord relinquish its authority; the younger generation, on the other hand, must fight for its own liberation. The liberation of the younger generation cannot be the task of the adults; it must be accomplished by youth itself. Both generations must proclaim the Rights of the Child.

The theory of free education was popular in Soviet Russia only during the first years following the November Revolution. Even then the theory met with strong criticism and was never fully accepted by the Soviet Government and the Communist Party.

The First All-Russian Congress on Pre-School Education

The First All-Russian Congress on Pre-School Education was held in Moscow from April 25 to May 4, 1919. Four hundred and sixty-three delegates with decisive vote and 105 with deliberative vote participated.

Mme. D. A. Lazurkin, member of the Communist Party and representative of the Commissariat of People's Education, read the

main report: *On the New Purposes of Pre-School Education under the New Conditions of Social Life.*⁶

Mme. Lazurkin saw the main purpose of education to be the "development of a harmonious personality." Such a development is possible only in a socialist society. The family of today, Mme. Lazurkin contended, is quite unable to develop the "harmonious personality," the useful citizen of his country. Therefore it is imperative to introduce universal and compulsory education for children beginning with those in early childhood. It is equally indispensable to promote the new socialist culture and to create an environment in which the creative personality of the child may freely develop.

Mme. Lazurkin made use in her report of some of the terminology used by the advocates of free education, but her ideas, of course, have nothing in common with those of Wentzel. Speaking in the name of the Soviet Government, Mme. Lazurkin advocates the education of children in a socialist spirit by socialist educators. Mme. Lazurkin's report was approved by the congress, but some of her theses met with criticism on the part of members of the congress who appeared to dislike the terminology of free education.

Mr. Sazonov, for example, believed that "development of a harmonious personality," which Mme. Lazurkin considered as the main purpose of education, was a vague and confused expression.⁷ He did not like the expression "creation of a certain environment," because, he said, it reminded him of the theory of free education supported by Wentzel which holds that it is sufficient merely to create surroundings, however formal, and that in these the child will freely develop.

Another educator, Mme. Abramov, devoted her entire speech to criticism of Wentzel's theory.⁸ In Mme. Abramov's opinion, the

⁶ [First All-Russian Congress on Pre-School Education] (Moscow, Gosizdat, 1921), pp. 8-16. [In Russian.]

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

supporters of free education contend that it is sufficient to provide four walls as surroundings and that the child will create the rest himself. It is wrong, asserted Mme. Abramov; child education is entirely dependent on the environment and it is therefore imperative to create an environment which will develop the child's collectivist feelings.

Moreover, Mme. Abramov argued, free education does not recognize any authority, any leadership: "But we have our authority—Karl Marx—and our children must learn from this authority." Mme. Abramov contended further that free education is an anarchical doctrine that teaches repudiation of all discipline. On the contrary, she says, "We believe in discipline, in subordination to the community, in authority and in leadership."

All-Russian Congress on Family Education

During the All-Russian Congress on Family Education, which was held in the early 1920's, Wentzel read a report on "The Free Education and the Family." This report met with strong criticism from many of his colleagues, especially from S. A. Zolotarev, Professor K. I. Povarnin, and Professor Nechaev. But if the objections at the preceding congress were based on a certain political-world outlook, the criticism by the members of the Congress on Family Education were purely pedagogical. Wentzel quotes it in his book, *The Theory of Free Education and the Ideal Kindergarten*.

These criticisms may be summarized as follows:

1. Free education rejects experimental pedagogy and practically nullifies all education, because it demands complete noninterference with the child.
2. The child is born with certain hereditary inclinations, some socially desirable, others harmful. The educator must promote the desirable inclinations and prevent the bad ones from developing.
3. Free education prepares a sad future for the child: he will suffer much in adulthood because life itself will limit his freedom

in a much more brutal way than did the expert hand of the educator.

4. Free education rejects any subordination "even in the most delicate form." Therefore, it rejects not only advice, recommendations, and suggestions on the part of the educator, but also teaching by means of personal example, since the latter could be seen as a desire to influence the child and to subordinate him to the educator's ideas.

5. The purpose of education is not merely to develop a personality, but to develop a *morally valuable* personality.⁹

Soviet Industrialization and Free Education

In the late 1920's the theory of free education had almost no following whatever. The *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* contained a biography of Wentzel in which he was described as one of the most outstanding supporters of free education. The article conceded the popularity of this doctrine during the years immediately following the revolution, but contended that this popularity was bound to decline for two reasons: the theory of free education contained idealistic and individualistic elements, but it did not comprehend that education must be carried out in a class spirit.¹⁰

During the 1930's the five-year plans and the menace of Nazi Germany called for a strengthening of discipline in industry and in the army. The Soviet Government was aware of the fact that this could be achieved only if discipline were introduced as a basic element in education from early childhood.

The most outstanding supporter of this theory was Anton Makarenko, who became the most renowned educator in the Soviet Union during the mid 1930's. Makarenko, who died in 1939 at the age of fifty, was for many years director of a colony for young delinquents. His *Pedagogical Poem*, *Book for Parents*, and *Lectures for Parents on Education* were widely read. The lectures for parents were broadcast over the radio and brought thousands of enthusi-

⁹ Wentzel, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-70.

¹⁰ [*Great Soviet Encyclopedia*] (Moscow, 1928), X, 239-40. [In Russian.]

astic letters to the author. The *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* devoted a highly eulogistic article to Makarenko.

It is difficult to imagine a doctrine more contrary to the theories of free education than Makarenko's. In his *Lectures for Parents*, he emphasizes that there must be strict discipline at home and that parents must never allow any breach of discipline.¹¹ Orders should be issued briefly, only once, and in such a manner that the child will understand that he *must* obey. A parent's order should never be rescinded; it must always be executed. If the child disobeys, he must be punished. Makarenko recommends depriving the child of a pleasure or of his allowance or forbidding him to meet his school friends. In his *Pedagogical Poem* he even tells how in anger he once beat an impudent boy in the colony for young delinquents and what good results this beating had.¹² Makarenko considered discipline as a main foundation of education. He demanded strict subordination of children to their parents and educators. Only education based on discipline can create a young generation possessed of strong will, courage, and a sense of duty and honor.

Professor Eugene Medynsky contends that Makarenko created a new conception of discipline.¹³ Education had been dominated heretofore by the Herbartian conception of discipline," says Professor Medynsky. "... Herbart considered discipline only as a means of education. Makarenko counterposed to this limited conception of discipline the attitude toward discipline as not only a means, but also an end of education."

In a semiofficial symposium, *Pedagogics*, the authors including Professor P. N. Gruzdev and others, do not go as far as Makarenko. However, they, too, consider "development of a sense of organization and of discipline" as the foundation of the preschool child's education. The authors of the symposium emphasize the necessity

¹¹ [*Lectures for Parents on Education*] (Moscow, 1940), pp. 108-20. [In Russian.]

¹² Anton Makarenko, *Road to Life* [English translation of the *Pedagogic Poem*] (London, 1936), pp. 20-25.

¹³ "Anton Makarenko, Soviet Educator," *Volks-Bulletin* (1943), pp. 31-36.

of teaching "useful habits," especially the habit of work and of concentrating attention upon a certain subject as well as "the habit of obedience and of subordination of the child's will to the demands of the community." It does not matter that certain demands will be dictated to the child by the educator.

Pedagogics stresses the importance of the personal example given by the educator and the necessity of respecting the child's personality. Educators should not crush the child's will. They should only strive to see that it is correctly applied. The authors of the symposium speak also of punishment, which they euphemistically call "persuasive means," suggesting that it be used with tact and prudence. They quote Comenius to the effect that happy are those educators who can dispense with punishment. However, *Pedagogics* does not reject punishment and recommends, for example, isolation of the child from his group in the kindergarten, or, at home, from other members of his family.¹⁴

Conclusions

Free education was never popular in the U.S.S.R., except during the early years after the November Revolution when some Soviet educators believed that with the abolition of the capitalist regime there would be no need of discipline for the child growing up in a socialist environment.

The Soviet Government never accepted the theory of free education, although during the period 1917-1921 it practically allowed children full liberty. This was done, however, mostly for political reasons: the older generation was on the whole opposed to the Soviet regime, and consequently the policy of the Communist Party and of the government practically abolished the authority of parents and educators. Corporal punishment was forbidden, and any interference by adults was proclaimed as a reactionary method of education.

¹⁴ P. N. Gruzdev, *Pedagogics* (Moscow: Commissariat of People's Education of the R.S.F.S.R., 1940), pp. 172-74. [In Russian.]

With the close of the revolutionary period and with the establishment of the five-year plans, a gradual change took place. The demand for strict discipline in education, however, became very insistent, in the mid 1930's, with the growing danger presented by Nazi Germany. There was no doubt in the Soviet Union that the Nazis would sooner or later attack Russia. The country had to prepare for defense, industrialization had to be accelerated. Therefore Soviet youth had to be educated to acquire the qualities indispensable to make them good workers and soldiers: endurance, orderliness, obedience, courage, sense of duty. Soviet educators were convinced that such an education could be accomplished only if based on a strict discipline from early childhood. The whole program of education was modified accordingly. Today there is no progressive education in the Soviet Union.

Salomon M. Teitelbaum is the senior editor in the Editorial Division of the United Nations.

ON THE PROBLEM OF AMERICA'S CULTURAL MINORITIES

Joseph Schneider

I

The current preoccupation of educators and sociologists with the issue of cultural and racial amity in American life bears the imprint of being one more of those crusades in latter-day sin in which teachers and scholars so often become involved. The existing situation in the United States does not show any reason why at this time the problem of cultural and racial pluralism should be more urgent and pressing than, say, about twenty-five years ago. The contrary is more true, that is, if the intensified ethnocentric behavior abroad is put down for what it is, namely, an aspect of the crisis of our age. The threat to social order is clearly present in this kind of conduct, and, of course, must be dealt with. Still, anyone at all acquainted with the population composition of the United States today and the history of immigration into the country must, indeed, be puzzled by the attempts to meet the problems posed by recent outbursts of mass egocentric behavior through the employment of that curious *hyphenatedism* called cultural democracy.

The extinction of nativity differences in America has at no time been so full and complete. Acculturation is an accomplished fact. This does not mean that there is no intolerance, bigotry, and hate in the land. There is, but it has its roots elsewhere than in a clash of cultures, and involves peoples who never regarded themselves as a kind of corporate body with inherent rights of self-determination. If we exclude the Negro, the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Jew, this discrimination is generated more by the severe struggle for jobs and a living which our country has experienced during the past few decades, plus the madness and disorganization incidental to fighting two staggering wars within a single generation, than by the ob-

tuseness of the Old Americans or the fact that they do not value sufficiently the quaint and folksy customs of the outlanders as contributions to American civilization. One may well wonder where those strange customs are practiced which the aborigines, junior grade, do not esteem highly enough to convert this land of ours from a bull pit into a dove cot. The suspicion that the American people are being introduced into a new cult by the intellectual is not without a foundation.

II

The influx of outlanders ceased for all significant purposes with the beginning of hostilities in 1914, and was more or less permanently cut off in the 1920's by legislative prohibitions. Every immigrant group appears to have declined in numbers since 1920, and the "old" immigration began to decline after 1880. That means that the bulk of the foreign-born in the United States at the present are around 50 years of age or over. It also means that their numbers are being rapidly depleted by old age and death. Thus the problem of cultural democracy can only be applied to the first generation Americans of foreign parentage, and to a growing extent to the children of this population—second generation Americans of foreign parentage. To apply the phrases "minority peoples" and "minority cultures" to these populations does not make sense. It is another instance of that growing abuse of language in our age which tends to create problems where there are none. These populations bear the unmistakable imprint of the American public school and those informal agencies of indoctrination like the newspaper and the radio. These populations are almost totally ignorant of the mother tongue of the nativity groups from which they stem. Their knowledge of the culture of the several nativity groups from which they are descended is equally attenuated. If these populations show any distinctive traits at all, it is that they attempt to be more American than the aborigines, junior grade. That is even true, to some

extent, of the aging immigrant population. After spending their adult lives working for a living in the United States and going to school, they show to their children the undeniable effects of the process of Americanization. It is not the losing war of keeping their cultural autonomy which the immigrant and his children are fighting. That war is more alive in the heads of the people whom we call "opinion makers" than in the populations in question. The battle which the immigrant and his children are fighting comes from having no indentifications of a substantial nature with either the old world or the new. These people are, for the present, culturally and socially adrift, and victims, more or less, of the personal demoralization that such a state induces. It seems more likely that what we face in the behavior of the immigrant and his child is what the sociologist calls marginal behavior.

The immigrants and their children, particularly the former, are marginal persons, not members of minority culture groups, that is, excepting as these populations identify themselves with the struggles for cultural autonomy and political independence going on in Europe. But that is another matter. The difficulties of assimilation which must be faced by the several nativity groups in the American community are not lessened by this kind of an estimate of the immigrant problem. Moreover, the descendants of the "newer" immigration (Austrians, Hungarians, Italians, southeastern Europeans, Polish and Russian Jews) have encountered especial difficulties. They were until just recently publicly branded as biologically inferior and unassimilable by the Old Americans, and as such regarded as a threat to our democratic institutions until the rise of Hitlerism in Europe made that line wholly suspect.

An acknowledgment of the kinds of discrimination faced by the descendants of the "newer" immigration does not make their presence in the greater population a minority problem. The dilemma of status is not what the nationality-minded European talks about when he speaks his piece about the self-determination and

rights of minority peoples. He is thinking about something else. He is concerned with establishing the thesis of the self-sufficiency or exclusiveness of each culture or quasi-culture group. The process of assimilation which has been at work in the United States is just what he is opposed to. The European nationalist abhors assimilation as much as does the Jew, and not because the process does not ultimately work itself out when not complicated or concealed by sectarianism, but because assimilation signifies a subversion of something which should be preserved in its own right as precious, as qualitatively significant. A minority problem does not arise through the operation of the processes of assimilation and the marginal behavior which accompanies it in the individual. The minority problem is anthropogeographical, political, and philosophical.

There can be no minority problem in an area where the population referred to does not attempt to establish separatist tendencies for one reason or another, and then endeavors to perpetuate them in their children through the various devices of cultural and spacial isolation. None of the major European immigrant groups in the United States has tried to set itself apart in the new habitat. The initial segregation which occurred among immigrant groups in the cities of the Atlantic seaboard and the middlewest after the Civil War was dictated by the exigencies of the situation. The ecological segregation of Italians and Poles, for example, was unplanned. There was no conscious effort or aim present among these peoples to perpetuate in the United States the cultural heritages of Italy or old Poland. The fact of the matter is that the "newer" immigration was motivated least of all by considerations other than those of escaping from conditions of intolerable hardship and poverty. Of the motives, three in number, usually given for immigration into the New World, God, glory, and gold, the last more nearly describes the motivation of the "newer" immigration. Every immigrant group has submitted to the indoctrination of its children in the American way of life in the public school. Opposition to com-

pulsory school attendance laws has been based more on the ground of the economic worth of the child as a breadwinner, and seldom seriously because the education of the child would mean a subversion of the cultural heritage of the immigrant parent. The "newer" immigration seems at no time to have been ill-disposed toward the American creed of success, individual advancement, and conspicuous consumption.

These observations must not be construed to mean that European immigrants and their children have not been made the victims, more or less, of the sort of abusive treatment which *strangers* everywhere seem to receive. They have, and the damage done will be evident in the American community in malformed personalities for a long time to come. Their discernible behavior differences have generated prejudices against them. The generally swarthy complexion of the "newer" immigrant has also helped. The American middle class has used all these differences in the behavior and appearance of the immigrant to their own advantage in the prevailing system of economic organization. But, at the peril of seeming to belabor the point, the presence of discrimination does not constitute the core element in the concept "minority peoples." To merit such a label a people must show a conscious, purposive adherence to a traditional culture by such devices as separate schools, opposition to exogamous or out-marriages, spacial segregation, and the cultivation of a sense of superior virtue or notion of destiny. The only European immigrant peoples who can qualify as minority culture groups are, strangely enough, the religious bodies like the Mennonites, Doukhobours, Amish, and the Jew. (The one indigenous and active minority people in America, Jehovah's Witnesses, are never mentioned by the intellectual sponsors of cultural democracy.)

There is no way by which the views about the justification and perpetuation of conscious ethnocentric groups, whether sacred or secular, can be harmonized with democratic ideals and the larger social order. The spirit of democracy is cosmopolitan, based upon a

matter-of-fact and common-sense view of the nature of the objective world, plus the metaphysical assumption of the absolute worth, dignity, and incomparability of the individual—any individual. The preachers of sectarianism are not the heralds of the democratic millennium. Sectarianism is the prison house of individualism, not a blueprint of the future society of the free man. Minority peoples are distinguished by their collective and cultivated uncommonness. In a sectarian society the individual is in bondage to group egoism. If the American defender of the tradition of cultural democracy replies to all this that he is not using the term *minority peoples* in this antidemocratic sense, but only as a device to point up the syncretic, composite, character of American civilization, the rejoinder is that the same may also be said about the civilizations of European nation-states. The American scene is different, perhaps, only in its contemporaneity.

Sectarianism of any kind can at best achieve in the larger community only that unstable and uncertain peace which the sociologist calls accommodation. Judaism, for instance, can survive only if the Jewish community stands aloof from the larger community and appeals to the humanitarianism, toleration, and conscience of the Gentile to give his consent. But the attempted adjustment is unsatisfactory just because it relies upon an appeal to sentiment. The individual Jew struggles against the Gentile in these disturbed times for the prizes which the dominant culture holds up to the winners. The individual Jew is one with the Gentile in the routine of daily toil by which we all must obtain a living. It is in this observation that is to be located, in part at least, the rising antipathy toward the Jew in our time. The area in which more and more people are making their living is in the city. The Jew is more and more coming into direct competition with the Gentile white-collar worker who has only his talents to exchange for a living. This denizen of the city has no inherited wealth or land to give him status. How well he lives and the security of his future depends upon his

brain power and the fortunes of the market place. His way of life constrains him to slough off in a pinch all traces of decency, urbanity, and tolerance. It may, therefore, be asking more of mankind than can be granted to keep the peace under the conditions of battle and struggle present in a society made up of a growing extent of Gentile clerical, semiprofessional, and professional workers. The conscious egocentrism of the Jew makes him an easy target in a culture where increasing numbers of people are making their living in those pursuits in which the Jew, because of his longer habituation to city ways and his penchant for hard work, has been generally engaged with eminent success. It may be a paradox, but it is nonetheless true that the most subtly vicious forms of anti-Semitism in our time have been spawned in the Jew-Gentile relationships involving the better educated, the men and women in the professions, for example. Who but a college president could justify the practice of admitting Jews to our institutions of higher learning on the basis of their relative numbers in the total population!

The fact to which the proponents of cultural pluralism give too little heed is that behavior differences are seldom viewed as simply variant ways of possibly doing the same thing. Variations in acquired behavior are never commensurable to the man in the street. Christianity is not just a different confession from Judaism; neither is Catholicism just a different confession from Congregationalism. Polygyny and monogamy are not viewed as variant ways of securing for the child a place in the group; although both are widespread forms of human marriage. The unconscious ethnocentrism, consciousness of kind and like-mindedness, which develops among the individuals belonging to any group makes certain of that. Even the anthropologist and sociologist do not always succeed in accepting the range of cultural differences which exist in our world as simply a fact. Indeed, so common is the tendency to hierarchize differences, to assign higher worth to one set of learned behavior traits than to another, that it probably belongs to the irreducible core of elements

from which group life develops. Still the plain truth of the matter is that no set of acquired behavior traits has proved inadequate in the activities of survival and reproduction. The most loathsome traits of contemporary primitives adequately provide for the conditions of sustaining life, and no cultural system can do more.

But be that as it may, the cultural pluralist believes that a way can be found to overcome this perversity which mankind shows in placing value judgments on differences in collective behavior. One way which has suggested itself as a device for diminishing the clashes which arise from group ethnocentrism involving Jews and Gentiles is the proposal that a social system be tolerated which involves the principle of fixed hereditary statuses as assigned to individuals on the basis of their religious beliefs. On a larger scope, what the proposal resolves itself into is a design for a kind of caste or feudal society as pertains to the relations of "majority" and "minority" culture groups, and a class organization as applied to the individuals in each of these groups. The word caste is not exactly appropriate to describe what is intended, because castes are arranged in a hierarchy from higher to lower and the plan set forth attempts to overcome just that. Each culture group is to be equal to the other; it is to be self-determining within broad limits. An illustration of what is intended may help.

An individual of Jewish confession is to have membership in a culture group which is equal as to rights with the group to which the individual Gentile belongs. Crossing over from one group to the other by contracting exogamous marriages is to be forbidden by law. Then within each of the parallel groups there is to exist free competition for statuses and roles, that is, a class system. According to the scheme here outlined, the future of American society may be envisioned as a juxtaposition of social and cultural islands, each containing its own class hierarchy where achievement alone is to determine who gets what, when, and how. The number of social and cultural islands is not enumerated by the proponents of cultural

democracy, but it could be quite large and might conceivably include, in addition to the religious minorities, the Negro, the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Mexican.

It is not my aim here to criticize this way of social thinking beyond observing that the high rate of occupational and spacial mobility which is present in urban cultures does not augur well for this kind of plan to end the Jewish problem or any other genuine minority problem. The history of American communisms and socialisms during the 1830's and 40's is sufficient testimony to jeopardize the proposal. The pull of the dominant culture is too great for one thing. Still, it must be observed that a kind of arrangement of the sort suggested already exists in the American community as pertaining to the relationships of Negroes and whites, without resolving the dilemma of being black in a white man's world. The liberation of the Negro from slavery did not make him equal to the whites in status, economic or social. Emancipation merely made available to him a free market, more or less, in which he could sell his talents, leaving the older caste relationship intact. As a result there has been slowly emerging a class hierarchy within the Negro group. The hierarchy is still incomplete at the top, but recent events have tended to increase the rate of vertical mobility among Negroes. What all this could mean is that the Negro is to have the same social opportunities as the white man to achieve higher social position within his own caste, providing both races have equal access to the resources of the land.

It is the purpose of intelligence to direct the individual's activities into relationships which tend to be more consistent with things-as-they-are, not finding ways of consecrating ancient tribalisms, superstitions, and prejudices. There is no sound sociological reason for supposing that planned ghettos will be more free of clashing ethnocentrisms and hates than the common garden variety. They might even be less so. In planned arrangements of this kind all peoples, "minority" as well as "majority," would have a

common stake in the propagation of the greater culture and share in its ethos. The attempts of the cultural pluralist to splinter the larger culture without also creating for each part an ecological base is not consistent with contemporary experience. The effects on the lives of all of us when the first is done without making provision for the second can be seen in the results of the peace settlements made after the First World War.

III

The writer has no prescription to compound for ending ethnocentric behavior. It must suffice to have called attention to the verbal device currently employed to describe this kind of conduct in the United States, and its complete inapplicableness to the American scene. Two things, however, may be observed. First, those who would hand the individual over for confinement in some lesser group which deems itself possessed of superior collective virtues, after rescuing him from the persecutions of the market place of race, creed, or nativity, are hardly to be reckoned as the harbingers of that newer individualism that we so desperately need today. Second, the bigotry, hate, and discrimination directed against individuals in America because of their chance membership in some racial, religious, or nationality group is a problem in civil liberties, the defense of the natural rights of man, not one of defending the rights of minority peoples. The individual in the American social and political tradition clearly does not exist for the benefit of the group, be it religious or otherwise.

Joseph Schneider is at the University of Minnesota.

THE BASIC DEFECT IN OUR EDUCATION

Rudolph M. Binder

One of the most important needs of every nation is education. America has long ago recognized this fact and has made ample, although not full, provision for it. Public schools have been established in every city, village, and country district. High schools are found in every city and in most of the larger villages. Colleges and universities are becoming more numerous and accessible. We spend over \$2,308,000,000 for public schools with their enrollment of over 24,000,000 pupils.

What are the results? We are not an ideal nation by any means. We still have several million illiterates; corrupt politics is still hindering a more efficient government in the nation as a whole and more particularly in our large cities. We still have hundreds of millionaires and millions of paupers, and other evils to contend with. Our worst affliction is, though, our record of crime, especially among our young people.

In 1944 we had 1,349,000 crimes of various kinds, ranging from murder to theft. The worst aspect of this situation is the number of young criminals. Although the population between ten and twenty-four years constituted only 27 per cent of the total population in 1944, it was accountable for 36.1 per cent of the crimes. And that is not all. While adult criminals are fingerprinted without exception, many judges refuse to submit youthful offenders to this ignominy. If this consideration had not been extended to the juveniles they would be accountable for at least 40 per cent of the total crimes instead of 36 per cent.

What is the remedy? Educators have suggested all kinds of changes in our schools, ranging from smaller classes and better equipped teachers to a more intensive teaching of science. These remedies are well chosen but they will not remove the main diffi-

culty. Teaching of science is perhaps the most propitious suggestion, provided that its fundamental principle is driven home. It will benefit a pupil but little if science is taught merely as a matter of information just like history. It is necessary that the basic principle of science should be emphasized throughout the course of education.

That basis is the *law of cause and effect*. It means that every action produces certain inevitable results. Two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen will always produce water and nothing else. And so with all other chemical combinations, no matter how varied and numerous the atoms may be. Certain kinds of atoms will produce sugar, other kinds, poison. And you cannot change that law no matter how hard you may try; it is a law of nature and inescapable.

This law applies not only in chemistry and physics, it applies in every sphere of life. Every action is bound to produce certain definite results. Good acts produce good results; bad actions are always followed by evil results. Our moral laws are ultimately based on those of nature and are consequently unchangeable. It is true today as it ever was that "you cannot get grapes from thorns or figs from thistles" or "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." We are apt to look upon these and similar statements in the Bible as mere moral precepts. They are natural laws in the truest sense of the word, and as such they produce inevitable results no matter how we may try to evade them.

It is this law of cause and effect which needs not only to be taught in our education, it must be driven home. If the teacher incidentally calls attention to the fact that John Doe deserves praise for a certain act which benefited some other man, that is teaching the law of cause and effect. It is the same law when he is punished for an act that injured someone else. In the course of teaching, many opportunities present themselves to point out this law.

There is, however, a difference in the way the law works out in the material and the moral realms. A fire will burn until all the

inflammable material within its reach is consumed and that is the end of it. In the moral realm we deal with conscious human beings who remember what they have done. If a man has perpetrated a crime, that act will stick to his memory, no matter how he may try to get rid of it. But it must be got rid of if the perpetrator is to have any peace. There are two ways of doing this—reform or continuation.

Many men who have acted criminally realize sooner or later that they are headed for destruction and they try to change. Religion has a most potent effect and influence along this line. Other means are change of environment, restitution of the damage done, or changing one's occupation if the crime was not serious.

The other way of trying to escape this insistent voice is by an attempt to drown it. Some criminals believe that they are "marked" men and so they go on to other crimes which divert their attention from their accusing conscience. The percentage of redeemed criminals is not large. Society has called them "jailbirds" and they want to show their contempt of this ostracism; their chief concern is to devise ways and means not to be caught again.

Here lies the extreme danger of the first transgression. This is especially the case with boys. The boys' gangs always have a leader; he is nearly always considered a hero owing to his boldness and cleverness in escaping the police. This fact impresses the boy who has no other or higher ideal. He joins the gang and tries to imitate the leader; any success leads him further because it gains him recognition. His mind becomes warped and his conscience deadens. But try as he may, he cannot escape his conscience, and sooner or later he either quits the gang or, by adopting its ideals, he becomes an out-and-out criminal.

Suppose, though, that a man commits a minor crime about which nobody knows. He lives a decent life, is respected by his fellow men, and is successful in his occupation. What happens in such cases? We read occasionally about a man who has committed a serious crime, for which perhaps another was sent to prison, going to the

police to confess. He is not suspected and might go through the rest of his life as an honest person. But his conscience has been accusing him all the time until he becomes restless and can regain peace only by confession and taking the consequences if necessary. The best illustration of this on a large scale is the Federal Conscience Fund.

The United States has thousands of officeholders and other persons who have dealings with the government, especially with contracts and taxes. The Conscience Fund was established for those who had cheated the government but were not detected. The strange fact is that these people were honest in their other relationships in life. For five, ten, twenty, or even thirty years they succeeded in hiding their misstep, but the sting in their conscience gave them no peace. Whether the defalcations amounted to only a few pennies or to thousands of dollars, they could not rest until they had made restitution. The total sum returned to the government since the establishment of the Fund in 1811 reaches nearly one million dollars. The number of defaulters is unknown because no track was kept of them until 1945, when during seven months about 250 contributions were made. Only one year, 1845, shows a blank during this long period. The smallest return was in 1827, only \$6.00; the largest was in 1945, over \$118,000. That was a war year and wars have always had a corrupting influence.

Two special cases, the contributions of which are excluded in the totals given above, may be mentioned. One party returned \$70,681 in 1943 because he had made excessive profits on a government contract. The other party returned \$2,015,600 to the Fund, likewise for excessive profits. Whether it was fear of detection or the sting of conscience that led to these returns may be problematical. The Fund proves, though, that conscience is working and that the law still holds.

The law of cause and effect holds not only in the life of individuals but in that of nations, since they are composed of individuals. While we speak of good and bad men in ethics, we speak of good

and bad citizens in national affairs. This field covers a multitude of sins, only two of which need to be mentioned here: taxation and voting.

Since state and federal income taxes were introduced, a large number of taxpayers have been guilty of fraud. From time to time the newspapers report prosecutions of rich men and large corporations for cheating on their tax reports. Lesser frauds, though numerous according to the statements of many examiners, are too unimportant to be reported in the press. These people are honest in their dealings with other men. They pay their bills regularly and would not think of cheating anybody. Why then try to cheat the government? Their conscience accuses them and they try to find an excuse. "The government wastes a lot of money and I need mine for my own use." This charge cannot be denied. In our various grades of government there is much inefficiency and in most of our municipal governments considerable fraud.

What is the cause of these shortcomings? The fact that a considerable portion of our voters refuse to accept the small responsibility of casting their vote. In most municipal elections scarcely one half of the voters cast their ballot. This is the direct cause of inefficiency and corruption, since it leaves the election in the hands of the bosses who see to it that their hangers-on vote—not once but twice and even oftener. When the decent citizen forgets or neglects his duty, the field is left wide open to those who want to control the municipal government for their own selfish purposes. Even in presidential elections many citizens neglect to cast their ballot. In 1944 the potential voting population numbered nearly 84,000,000 but only 48,000,000 voted; over 43 per cent did not take the little trouble to help decide a national issue. They were "free" men without any obligation, however small. When we remember how much effort the two principal political parties exert to elect their candidates, it is surprising how many voters shun the polls. In municipal elections the majority of the voters turn out only when a striking

scandal has happened in the administration. The bosses are turned out but return after a few years because the majority of the voters stay away from the polls again.

The trouble with the income-tax evaders and nonvoters hinges on a misunderstanding of the terms rights and duties, or freedom and responsibilities. Rights and freedom are stressed in many ways. Newspapers, books, and lectures try to make us proud of our heritage of freedom, and even the most ignorant man is proud of being a member of a "free" nation, not subject to a dictator, monarch, or aristocracy. The schools do much good work along this line and it is a pleasure to hear our boys and girls talk proudly about being born in a free country. They have acquired much information about the various aspects of government, but little inspiration about their duties and responsibilities. If they had, the numbers of tax evaders, nonvoters, and juvenile delinquents would be much smaller.

Liberty has been the keystone of America's greatness. Many men realized that it was up to them to develop what talent they had. There were no obstacles to their effort to strive for something higher and better as was always the case in autocracies; there were no social barriers as was the case in aristocracies. The son of a shoemaker did not have to become a shoemaker or maybe a carpenter because the professions and the civil and military offices belonged to the scions of the aristocrats. The American boy knew that any enterprise was open to him. And this opportunity opened the gates to the inner urge to make the most of his talents. Thousands, perhaps millions, of our boys have advanced from apparently lowly positions to those of prominence.

This urge to use one's freedom always implies a feeling of obligation toward one's country. The man who realizes what great blessings freedom bestows also realizes that he must make some return. The more talented a man is, the stronger becomes this feeling of obligation. A great man does not talk much about freedom—

he takes that for granted—he talks about his duties and the ways to meet them. Lesser men feel and act similarly under more limited conditions. Almost every day we read about some new organization planning relief for the unfortunate, improving or removing bad conditions in the locality. Behind all these movements is a feeling of “must.” We are free to do it and so we must do it. Duty based on freedom is always at the root of these movements, no matter what name they bear. These people have come to realize that privileges imply responsibility, and that they are like the obverse and reverse of a coin. They are sensitive even when they have failed to do a good deed, and regret it possibly for years.

How is the law of cause and effect to be driven home? Not in an abstract and purely theoretical manner. It would be futile to introduce a special course on this subject because in that case the law would be considered merely another matter of information for passing an examination. The law must permeate every branch of teaching; it must become the foundation of all instruction. That can be done incidentally by calling attention to the fact that every action necessarily produces certain results. That is the law of nature and cannot be circumvented.

Science is the special field in which the law can be brought home. The combination of certain elements will necessarily produce a given result, no matter what we desire or hope for. The law holds in every field of science—chemistry, physics, zoology, botany. And the alert teacher always has the opportunity when he comes to a striking case to remark that the law holds in everyday life as well. The schools are, after all, not something apart from life, but a part of it. Information is not the ultimate aim of education but a means to make life richer and fuller, and to build good character.

History is another field for teaching this law. There is nothing more inspiring to young people than the defense of liberty. Whether we go back to the Greeks fighting the Persians at Marathon, or study the defense of liberty of our forefathers during the

Revolution, such willingness to sacrifice one's life if necessary for the sake of a principle is always inspiring.

On the other hand, hardly anything is more depressing than the story of ruthless conquerors, although most of our history books recount their victories in glowing colors and hardly ever tell of the downfall of these men. Two cases will illustrate this. Napoleon conquered nearly all Europe and to this day history books always exalt him as a great hero and only incidentally mention his death as a prisoner on the island of Saint Helena at the age of 52. Adolf Hitler is still fresh in our memory. Americans have no idea how he was extolled in Germany when he took many countries by force of arms and tried to enslave them, but he died ingloriously by his own hand and Germany has to pay for his crimes. Aggressive wars have always been wrong and ended in the death or downfall of their leaders and in the misery of their countries. The teacher of history has an excellent opportunity to show these workings of the law of cause and effect.

Literature is another field to bring this law home. Fortunately this seems to be realized; whether it is done deliberately or unconsciously does not matter. Readers have an instinctive craving for the happy ending. The villain must be punished and the hero rewarded. This feeling is so deeply imbedded in our consciousness that few writers dare to defy it. Whether we are clearly conscious of this law or not, we want it observed in our literature. And the teacher has an excellent opportunity to point out that this law holds not only in novels but in life.

Deliberately wrong actions are, though, not the only source of trouble. Ignorance and shortsightedness may cause incalculable harm. One case as an example: At a recent meeting of the United Nations Organization in London the fact was brought out that after the First World War some businessmen in our country raised \$20,000,000 for propaganda to keep us from joining the League of Nations. A very prominent United States Senator led the move-

ment. And this notwithstanding that President Wilson and other prominent men were in favor of it. It has been stated repeatedly by some of our foremost men that, if we had joined the League of Nations, the Second World War would have been prevented and any amount of misery avoided. The effect on our government was enormous. At the end of the First World War our national debt had risen from \$12,000,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000. At the end of the Second World War it had climbed to nearly \$280,000,000,000.

The law of cause and effect holds in all spheres of life. Whether an act springs from wickedness or ignorance, it has its inevitable results. Regret and sorrow will not alter that fact and cannot bring the dead man back from the grave.

Every evildoer must reckon with one fact, the sting in his conscience which will never leave him. He may be forgiven and accepted by society but he will never get rid of that sting which pursues him all his life. That is the law of cause and effect. It is the law of nature and as such inexorable.

Rudolph M. Binder is Professor Emeritus of Sociology at New York University.